public is crying out for, and I hope that we do, otherwise we will be continuing to speak out on the Democratic side of the aisle every night to demand action on these important issues that the American people want to see attended to.

THE BUDGET

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 1999, the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Speaker, this is the first time I think all year I have taken a special order. I have done a number in past years, but I am very grateful to have the time to do this.

Before I discuss the budget, which I intend to talk about in my special order, I would just make the comment that quite often the criticism on the other side of the aisle is that we spend too much or we are not spending enough. And it is really important, I think, for the other side of the aisle to decide on one of their arguments and then we can have an honest debate about it. We want an across-the-board 1 percent cut, and yet we are hearing on the other side of the aisle that we should not make that reduction; yet we are also hearing that we are spending too much.

Before I talk about my budget, we have the chairman of the Committee on Education and the Workforce, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GOODLING), really the most informed and most dedicated person on the issue of education, and I would like to give him an opportunity to make some comments on what we are doing in education.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

One of the most frustrating experiences I have had in my entire career in the Congress of the United States is to see us, and in very well meaning efforts, budget billions of dollars and then appropriate billions of dollars to try to reduce the gap between the advantaged and the disadvantaged students in this country and to sit there and realize that no matter how well meaning the attempt was, in many instances it was wrong from day one.

We know that, and knew from the very beginning, that the manner in which we were trying to deal with Head Start was not going to give the youngsters a head start. We knew very well that it became a poverty jobs program instead of a program to make sure that disadvantaged youngsters and poor youngsters had an opportunity to become reading ready before they went into a failing 1st grade experience.

We did the same thing with Title I, more than $120 billion. Again, we realized in many instances that that became a poverty jobs program rather than a program to reduce the achievement gap between advantaged and disadvantaged youngsters. And, in fact, unfortunately, we even have examples of where the opposite happened; that the gap even widened.

That is why it is so difficult for me now to watch us make the same mistake with the 100,000 teacher idea that is presented by the administration. I am not certain that my colleagues realize that in the first group where the contracts were let, it is somewhere between 21,000 and 29,000 new teachers, we cannot quite find out exactly how many it is, but there was no accountability whatsoever. The only requirement was a reduction of class size.

Well, everybody knows that if a parent has an opportunity to have their child in a classroom with a quality teacher with 28 students, or they have an opportunity to have their child in a classroom with 18 students with mediocrity leading that class, parents are going to choose the quality teacher. But every one of those grants that went out, nothing was asked in return in relationship to we will improve the academic achievement of all of these students, the most needy students, the most disadvantaged students. They just had to reduce class size.

So we came to the floor of the House and, with a bipartisan effort, passed the Teacher Empowerment Act. And in that act we said the first responsibility, the major responsibility, is to reduce class size, but do not do it unless a qualified teacher can be put in that classroom; and do not do it if there is no classroom to put the new teacher in. As a matter of fact, if it must be used, use it to improve the quality of the teachers presently in the system.

And today the headline in the New York Daily News is ''Not Fit to Teach Your Kid. In some city schools 50 percent of teachers are uncertified.'' And all we are doing is adding to that lack of certified, lack of qualified teachers in the classroom by merely saying take this money, reduce class size, it does not matter who it is that is teaching in that classroom.

Now, I would imagine that of this 50 percent there are probably 25 percent of those people who could become very excellent teachers in a very difficult situation if they could divert money to properly prepare and train them to teach. One of the requirements the State says is that we will require that, for instance, a high school teacher has to be certified to teach the subject they are teaching. Big deal. I would hope so. I would hope a math teacher or a science teacher is certified and qualified and knows how to teach math and knows how to teach science.

But all we do with the 100,000 teachers is say they must reduce class size. It does not matter where there is inequality. And that is a tragedy, because we know that cannot work. We know that they have to have the flexibility to use some of the funds to properly prepare the teachers that they have. This city would not have 50 percent uncertified teachers. They do not do that because they want that to happen, they do it because they do not have qualified teachers and they cannot get certified teachers.

And, of course, just being certified does not mean they are qualified. However, what it does mean is that the State of New York has said that the minimal requirement they should have before they go before a class as a teacher is what the State has outlined. These 50 percent do not have those minimal qualifications.

So I would hope, and again this is a budget issue, this is an appropriations issue, but, gee, let us do something about closing that gap between the advantaged and the disadvantaged. Let us not just give lip service to the fact that if somehow or other we reduce class size all of that will happen.

The most important person in a child's life is, first, the parent; second, is a quality teacher; and, third, and we do this in Even Start, those who are parents that are not able to prepare their child for a good learning experience by the time they reach first grade we also say we need to help make sure that that parent is the child's first and most important teacher.

So as we go through this budget debate, as we go through this debate in relationship to appropriations, I hope that we will think about children, and I hope that we will realize that the programs have not worked. And all the auditors have ever done is say the money went to the right place, but they never said we accomplished anything to change that achievement gap.

So again I appeal to the administration. Let us talk in terms of how we make sure that every teacher in that classroom is a qualified teacher so every child has a chance to succeed. And I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

Mr. SHAYS. It has been my pleasure. Mr. Speaker, when I was elected in 1987, I had had 12 years, actually 13 years experience in the State House in Connecticut, where I was the ranking member of both the appropriations committee and the finance committee. And it amazed me as a member in the State House how Members in Congress could ignore the requirement to get our country's financial house in order. On the State level we simply had to stay within a budget, we had to stay within the flow of funds that presented themselves in terms of revenue.

We are in an extraordinarily interesting time because we have seen a lot happen since 1987 when I was first elected. When I was first elected, I joined forces with my colleague, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KASICH), who really led the fight as a minority member at the time, who started to present ways to slow the growth of what we call mandatory spending, which are what others refer to as entitlements and to actually cut what government spends.

When we look at our Federal budget, only one-third is what we vote on each and every year. Over 50 percent are actually on automatic pilot, unless we change the requirements. If a program fits the title, they get the money, whether it is Medicaid, Medicare, Social Security is a retirement system, but if an individual puts into the fund, they are entitled to certain benefits, and there are other entitlements as well. So we have about one-third of the budget that we actually vote on and two-thirds we are just on automatic pilot.

And everyone seemed content to allow that to happen. Part of that automatic pilot was interest on the national debt, which is almost 14 percent of our overall budget.

☐ 2130

It was interesting as Congress pre-1987 had adopted Gramm-Rudman. That was a program that was adopted before I was elected. The interesting thing about Gramm-Rudman, it basically said you had to stay within certain budget caps, except it only was on that one-third of the budget. And so what Members started to do is they could not stay within the budget caps of what we vote on in defense and non-defense budgets, the 13 budgets that we work on, so what they did is they started to put things into the entitlements and make the automatic pilot grow even faster and faster.

I would like to go through certain budget charts and I would like to thank my own staff member, Peter Carson, who is my AA, or what we refer to as an AA is really your chief of staff and serves with me on the Committee on the Budget as well as Dick Magee who is on the Committee on the Budget as a staff member and who helped me prepare these charts. I would like to go through 10 charts and describe what has happened since 1992 and what we project out to the year 2009.

What is interesting to me is that when I was elected early on in 1987, we were looking at deficits as far as the eye could see. But just before you had a new Republican majority, the estimates for what that deficit would be are shown in the lower red line on this chart to my right. We were looking at deficits in the estimate in 1992 of $291 billion, then going to $310 billion, $291 billion, but by the year 1999, the year we just concluded, we were looking at deficits of $404 billion. And in the budget we are in the process of adopting, deficits of $455 billion, just in that one year. In other words, $455 billion more money going out than coming into the Federal Government.

When we made the estimates in 1995, we were still looking at deficits, the middle red line, as far as the eye could see, not above the line in which we have more revenue coming in than going out. Even in our estimates in 1997, just before we adopted the balanced budget agreement, we were looking at deficits of $108 billion, $124 billion, $120 billion, $147 billion, ad infinitum. Only deficits. We passed an historic budget agreement in which we slowed the growth of entitlements and we cut government spending. From that, we started to see a significant change.

This second budget chart just shows you the change in revenue estimates based on October 1999 and January 1999. The blue line was the estimate in January 1999. Even then, just within a year, we are seeing a significant increase in the amount that we anticipate, just over a change of 10 months. Revenues are coming in at a much greater rate. They are coming in for a number of reasons. First and foremost, we have an extraordinarily well educated populus that compete with anyone in the world. The cold war is over and admittedly the world is a more dangerous place but we are able to focus more now on economic competition with our trading allies and we are finding that we are quite able to compete. And so revenues are coming in at a much greater rate because of that. But it is also coming in because Congress in particular, and this new Republican majority, quite frankly, put the emphasis on getting our country's financial house in order. We started to reduce our deficits, which started to reduce the interest payments that we have to make, which started to help contribute to lowering interest rates in general and helping to increase the employment rate and decrease the unemployment rate.

This next chart illustrates why this Republican majority is concerned about taxes. Revenues are coming in at an extraordinary rate. People have become quite successful, our businesses are able to compete with the best in the world, and we are seeing a lot of small businesses that are generating awesome economic activity and even our large businesses have become much more efficient and they are able to produce more at a cheaper cost and able to pass on some of that cost savings to consumers and also able to make a profit and to pay their employees more who in turn can buy more goods. But what is of concern to us is in 1945, just at the end of World War II, we had the gross domestic product, revenues constituted 20.4 percent of all of the gross domestic product of our country, 20.4 percent were coming into the coffers of the Federal Government. In 1950, that went down to 14 percent. But you can see that it has gotten back to its all-time high of 20.7 percent, and we anticipate that it is going to continue to grow and grow. The question is, what is going to happen to that revenue?

Now, another chart that illustrates our concern with taxes are the fact that in 1947, if you took all of the Federal, State and local tax revenues, it accounted for 21.7 percent of our gross domestic product. But our Federal, State and local revenues now constitute 31.2 percent. Again, our concern is with the increase in revenue that is coming to both the Federal, State and local government, what is to happen to that revenue? Are we going to spend it and make all three governments larger and larger and larger? Or are we going to look to return some of that revenue back to the taxpayers who are paying that?

The next chart that I want to show is a chart that illustrates Congressional Budget Office estimates since 1992 to the year 2009 of the total amount of receipts coming in with the total amount of outlays, the money going out. The key point is the year 1998, in which for the first time since 1968 that we had more revenue coming in than going out. Now, since 1960, the Federal Government has been spending Social Security reserves. It has been spending it on mandatory spending and it has been spending it on the appropriations expenditures that we have, the 13 budgets. We have been taking since 1960 Social Security money and spending it. Basically it is being used to disguise the overall debt of our country.

But the first thing we had to deal with before we even dealt with that was to just make sure that we had an economist's view of a balanced budget, which was more money coming into the Federal Government than going out. Not only were we spending Social Security money but even with the Social Security money, we were still spending more than was coming in.

So our first objective in the balanced budget agreement of 1997 was to reach that point, that point in which receipts started to overtake outlays. We had a 5-year plan to do it. We passed it in 1997 and we anticipated by the year 2002 that we would finally reach that point in which revenues would exceed our outlays or our expenditures. But it happened in the first year of the balanced budget agreement. In other words, revenues came in at a faster rate than even we anticipated. Again, I raise the question, what is to happen to those revenues? Do we spend them? Do we pay down debt with them? Or do we return them to the American people by cutting taxes?

This chart is really one of the ones I find most interesting, at least in trying to explain why in the world would this Congress want to cut taxes and why by such a large amount of money. The Congressional Budget Office anticipated, and so did the Office of Management and Budget of the President, that in the next 10 years, we would have $3 trillion more money coming in to the Federal Government than going out. Both OMB, the Office of Management and Budget, and CBO, the Congressional Budget Office, both of them agreed that of that $3 trillion, $2 trillion was Social Security money, and $1 trillion was true surplus. In other words, no longer having to spend that Social Security money since 1960, even then we would still have a surplus over the next 10 years of $1 trillion, or almost $1 trillion. Admittedly, in the first year, it would be $147 billion, in the year 2000, rather, $147 billion of Social Security reserves that we would have and not spend, and then $14 billion that was a true tax overcharge, in other words, more money coming in. What is to happen to that $14 billion? What is to happen to the $38 billion in the year 2001? What is to happen to the $28 billion in the year 2002? These are excess moneys, what I call a tax overcharge. We are taxing people more than we are actually going to spend. And then in the year 2005, $92 billion. And in the year 2006, $129 billion. And then 2007, $146 billion; 2008, $157 billion; 2009, $178 billion. What is to happen to that? That amount of money that I have mentioned is marked in red. It was our view that most of it should be a tax cut, we should return it back to the American people.

Now, if I was a dictator, not even President, but if I was a dictator, what would I want to have happen? I would want to take all of this tax overcharge and I would want to pay down debt. That would be my first choice. But I happen to believe that if it is left on the table, it is going to get spent. In fact, the sad part of the story is that is actually what is starting to happen, because the President vetoed our tax cut. So you had $3 trillion, $2 trillion of it is truly for Social Security. What did we do? We took all of this money in this area here, the Social Security surplus, and we took that money and we did not spend it, we paid down debt with it. We reduced the debt of the United States owed to the American people and to businesses and to foreign interests that have helped fund our debt and we just started to pay down those obligations. That is what we want to do, $2 trillion of it. It was this $1 trillion that we debated.

Now, our Republican majority decided that we would provide a tax cut of almost $800 billion, which is about 80 percent of the total amount of what we call the true surplus.

I will illustrate it in another chart. This chart again illustrates the total amount of surplus, and in red is the amount for a possible tax cut. That is what is available. That is what is the true surplus. This part here is the money that we want to reserve for Social Security. The interesting thing is that the budget that we just concluded, we came so close for the first time in not spending Social Security reserves. In fact, the Congressional Budget Office determined that we actually had a true surplus of $1 billion. But the Office of Management and Budget, the office out of the White House, decided that they would hold $2 billion more in reserves, and by doing that, they are saying we are still spending $1 billion of the Social Security surplus. They determined that by simply deciding to hold on to $2 billion more in reserves. But whatever number you are using, whether we use the Congressional Budget Office that said we have truly for the first time since 1960 not spent Social Security, or even using the President's number of only spending $1 billion of it, in other words, even using the President's office, we have had a surplus of $123 billion, a true surplus of $123 billion. Actually, I want to say it differently. We have had a Social Security surplus of $124 billion, and a unified surplus of $123 billion. The White House says we are still spending $1 billion of Social Security money but the Congressional Budget Office says we have spent not $1 billion but actually have saved $1 billion.

Why would we want a tax cut? And how would we compare with the President? When the President presented his budget the beginning of this year, he did not want a tax cut. He wanted a tax increase.

☐ 2145

He actually wanted a net tax increase of $52 billion and, over 10 years, it would be $96 billion. So one can imagine our concern when we start seeing more surplus coming in, we are looking in 10 years of a true surplus of $1 trillion; and the President, instead of wanting to return that to the American people still wants to spend $52 billion over 10 years, have a tax increase of $52 billion over 5 years and $96 billion over 10 years. He wants a tax increase; we wanted a tax cut.

Now, our tax cut over 10 years, admittedly, would be $792 billion, about 80 percent of the protected surplus. Over 5 years, it would have been $156 billion. The reason we want that tax cut is, if we do not have a tax cut, it will be spent. It will be spent because Congress, even some of my colleagues on my own side of the aisle have programs they want to spend money on, and if it is left on the table, it will be spent.

Why do I know it will be spent? Because it has been in the past. We have had a budget agreement in 1997 where we had budget caps, but even before the agreement in 1997, we had the pay-go agreement with President Bush that said that one could not increase an entitlement unless one found another way to pay for it; one could not have a tax cut unless one found another way to pay for it.

Now, our problem was not the same in 1990 because we still had a deficit. We want a tax cut because we now have surpluses.

But this is my concern. And one will notice that there is a sharp increase in what happened in the budget of 1999, the one that just concluded. And that sharp increase occurred because a year ago at this time, the President of the United States, just before the congressional elections, decided that he would not agree to a budget unless we spent more. And sadly, too many on both sides of the aisle concurred with the President and agreed to spend more. We have never been within the budget caps because Congress has declared emergencies and Congress has done other approaches that have enabled us to go over the budget caps.

My big concern is this number right here and the trend line. Now, this is where we will be in this new budget agreement; and the question is, will we then go down and actually cut spending, or will it continue to rise? The one value to the budget caps have been that there has been some uniformity at least staying close to them. But sadly, a year ago, when the President demanded more spending, he got it. So why would I want a tax cut and why would other Members want a tax cut? Because if the money is left on the table, it is going to be spent. The sad point is that it is already being spent. All the money that we had reserved for a tax cut in our $800 billion tax cut that we sent the President and he vetoed is now being spent. It is not there for a tax cut.

Let me just show one last chart. This is a good news story, for the most part. It basically is showing what is happening to our national debt. Our national debt is starting to level off and it is starting to level off because we have surpluses, and it is starting to level off because we are going to use the Social Security surpluses and pay down public debt. Our debt to the trust funds continues to rise, but our debt, our public debt is going to fall and continue to fall because we are using the money from the trust funds to now at least pay off debt until we can reform Social Security.

I have a number of concerns about where we are at this point. The good news is that 10 years ago we had extraordinarily large deficits and when we looked at our estimates, those deficits were high then and they were looking to be even larger. We elected a new Republican majority. And I say new Republican majority because this was the first Congress that wanted to look at entitlements and slow their growth and wanted to cut some spending. And the end result has been that we have seen actual surpluses take place.

My concern is that we not begin to designate too much emergency spending that again allows us to go over the caps, that we do not have too many advanced appropriations that begin to appropriate money; the Committee on Appropriations appropriates money, but not spend out over 13 months instead of 12, and that we do not do other items that ultimately make our efforts to balance the budget next year more and more difficult.

The bottom line, we are getting our country's financial house in order. We are seeing an economy that is thriving; we are seeing more and more revenue come into the Federal Government, and what the American people are going to have to decide is what do we do with those surplus monies.

My hope, my prayer, and my votes are going to be to pay down the national debt. But if that is not going to happen, then it must be returned to the American people in tax cuts, because if it is not returned to the American people in tax cuts, then it will be spent as we are seeing happen right now.

What I would like to place ultimately the greatest emphasis on is we have been using Social Security funds since 1960, and we came so close this past year in not spending any Social Security money, according to the Congressional Budget Office, we have not according to the President, given the fact he took $2 billion out in reserves, and we have spent $1 billion of it. But next year, we intend to spend no Social Security money. We are going to use all of that to pay down the public debt. It is not going to be used to pay for programs. We are going to ultimately reduce our total debt.

The question is, what happens to that true surplus, above and beyond Social Security? Will it pay down public debt? Will it be returned to the American people in tax cuts, or will it be spent? And sadly, while we are in next year's budget not going to be paying, using Social Security money to balance our budget, we are not going to be using that money, I am afraid that the money that we had reserved for taxes is now being spent, and it is being spent frankly, in large measure, because my colleagues on the other side of the aisle are critical with our efforts to cut spending, even though they say we are spending too much in certain areas, they have opposed any efforts to try to cut spending or slow the growth in spending.

Mr. Speaker, if we cannot cut spending, if we cannot control the growth in government spending, there will be no money for tax cuts. It will all be spent.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON). Pursuant to clause 12 of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 9 o'clock and 54 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

☐ 2318

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. DREIER) at 11 o'clock and 18 minutes p.m.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1555, INTELLIGENCE AUTHORIZATION ACT, 2000

Ms. PRYCE of Ohio, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 106–460) on the resolution (H. Res. 364) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1555) to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2000 for intelligence and intelligence-related activities of the United States Government, the Community Management Account, and the Central Intelligence Agency Retirement and Disability System, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 76, WAIVING CERTAIN ENROLLMENT REQUIREMENTS FOR THE REMAINDER OF THE 106TH CONGRESS

Ms. PRYCE of Ohio, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 106–461) on the resolution (H. Res. 365) providing for consideration of the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 76) waiving certain enrollment requirements for the remainder of the first session of the One Hundred Sixth Congress with respect to any bill or joint resolution making general appropriations or continuing appropriations for fiscal year 2000, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1714, ELECTRONIC SIGNATURES IN GLOBAL AND NATIONAL COMMERCE ACT

Ms. PRYCE of Ohio, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 106–462) on the resolution (H. Res. 366) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1714) to facilitate the use of electronic records and signatures in interstate or foreign commerce, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 3073, FATHERS COUNT ACT OF 1999

Ms. PRYCE of Ohio, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 106–463) on the resolution (H. Res. 367) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 3073) to amend part A of title IV of the Social Security Act to provide for grants for projects designed to promote responsible fatherhood, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. REYES (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for November 5 on account of official business.

Mr. OWENS (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for today on account of official business.

Ms. CARSON (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for today on account of official business.

Mr. MENENDEZ (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for today on account of personal business.

Mr. PASCRELL (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for today on account of personal business.

Ms. KILPATRICK (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for today on account of official business.

Mrs. CHENOWETH-HAGE (at the request of Mr. ARMEY) for today on account of illness.

Mr. THOMAS (at the request of Mr. ARMEY) for today on account of personal reasons.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Ms. DELAURO) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. REYES, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. LIPINSKI, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. POMEROY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. KIND, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. MINGE, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. EHLERS) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. OXLEY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin, for 5 minutes, November 9.

Mr. PAUL, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. EHLERS, for 5 minutes, November 9.

Mr. KINGSTON, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan, for 5 minutes, November 9.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED

Bills of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 1346. An act to ensure the independence and nonpartisan operation of the Office of Advocacy of the Small Business Administration; to the Committee on Small Business.

S. 1418. An act to provide for the holding of court at Natchez, Mississippi, in the same manner as court is held at Vicksburg, Mississippi, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1769. An act to continue the reporting requirements of section 2519 of title 18, United States Code, beyond December 21, 1999, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ENROLLED BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

Mr. THOMAS, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 3122. An act to permit the enrollment in the House of Representatives child Care Center of children of Federal employees who are not employees of the legislative branch.

H.J. Res. 54. Joint resolution granting the consent of Congress to the Missouri-Nebraska Boundary Compact.

SENATE ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The Speaker announced his signature to enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles: